Report from Geneva

God and Free Enterprise: The Record of A Tired and Tumultuous Congress, See Pages 2-3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 31 SEPTEMBER 3, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

A Sedative While New Monsters Are Born

Geneva (By Airmail) Aug. 23

The nuclear test ban negotiations, after four years, remind one of those optical illusions which one moment appear to be a jumble of blocks and the next moment a staircase. At times, in sudden flashes of illusory perspective, the talks appear to have made steady progress. At other times, in colder light, the two thermonuclear powers seem as far apart as ever. Back in the halls of the *Palais des Nations,* among the familiar signs directing one to the *Comité Central de l'Opium* and the *Haut Commissariat pour les Refugiés,* it is easy to feel that nuclear testing is taking its place with narcotics and refugees on the agenda of the ever debated and the never resolved.

Still Filtering The News

A reporter, returning to these talks for the third time in 12 months, sees them as no more than a sedative to numb public awareness while new monsters are perfected. Outside the main Council chamber of the old League of Nations the newspapermen still wait on uncomfortable stone benches for the press officers to come out and brief them on what was said inside. Each country's reporters gravitate to their own country's briefing officer who filters the news, feeding it out at second hand, antiseptically, to ensure that the press gets the official slant on what transpired. The procedure, the issues, the arguments, the personalities, change so little as to lend an almost reassuring air of permanence to the talks.

The debate continues to be technical but the determining factors remain political. The United States, which has had most to gain by a cessation of testing, since it started first and was once far ahead, has been least disposed to stop. Our allies and the neutral powers, whose security we claim to be safeguarding by our tests, are all anxious for their cessation even—as Adlai Stevenson reported at the end of his recent European tour—without inspection. In Canada, in Britain, and in Sweden the governments are under strong pressure to reach agreement. This sharp difference between the U.S. and the rest of the West has given the Soviet Union leverage. The muscle-flexing speeches with which our officials have tried to convince the Russians of our overwhelming destructive power have served to give the Soviets an excuse for breaking the last test moratorium. Their bargaining position has hardened, not softened, while their latest exploits in space have had more impact than the speeches about our nuclear strength. Two years ago the Russians were willing to accept international listening posts on their soil, and a fixed quota of on-site inspections. Now their terms are national monitoring systems, on-site inspection by invitation only, and the right to test last.

This question of who shall test last is as big a trouble maker at Geneva as was the seignorial right under feudalism to test first. The Russians claim the right of the last test on the ground that they have had fewer than the West. But Mr. Kennedy made it clear at his July 23 press conference (see box on page 1) that we would insist on another round if we thought the new Soviet series had made significant progress. To give us time to assess the results of the Soviet tests and hold new tests of our own, the new U.S. proposals contain pitfalls in which the negotiations could bog down for months even if the Russians accepted obligatory on-site inspection. These hidden gimmicks explain the cheerful acceptance of the new U.S. bargaining position by such groups as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which have always opposed a test agreement.

Mrs. Myrdal of Sweden revealed at Geneva Aug. 1 that the French underground test in May, like the Soviet underground test in February, had been detected and identified by many stations around the world. She said that among the 65 stations reporting on the French test to the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey were seismic posts in countries as distant and as technologically backward as Bolivia and the Congo, Iran and Peru. Though Mrs. Myrdal's disclosures seem to have been filtered out of U.S. press dispatches, they strengthened the impression here that seismic monitoring was a good deal less esoteric than it had been cracked up to be and that an international commission, relying upon equipment on the territory of the non-nuclear powers, could adequately police a test

(Continued on Page Four)

Blind Alley Logic

"We will not test again unless . . . as a result of new Soviet tests we find ourselves unable to meet our commitments to our own people and those who are allied with us."

—President Kennedy at press conference July 23.

". . . there is the consideration that results if certain States insist that their security demands that they test nuclear weapons . . . if they feel they will be unfair to their peoples and to their friends if they do not develop and perfect—what a sad use of a good word!—weapons capable of annihilating scores of millions of human beings. In short, if certain governments assert the validity of that argument can they not see that they are encouraging other countries to follow the [same] path. . . . ?

"The Foreign Minister of an important country [China] said recently in Switzerland that his country's scientists were developing nuclear energy so that they would soon have nuclear weapons, and he said that if his country did not do this they would be regarded as contemptible by other countries."

—Mr. Lall (India) at Geneva arms parley Aug. 20.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some Realities Press and Public Overlooked in A Senate Filibuster

A Congress Strong on Free Enterprise But Weak on Civil Rights . . .

By Marvin Caplan

In the late afternoon of Aug. 17th, Sen. John O. Pastore (D., R.I.), floor manager of the pending bill, informed the Senate he could vote to turn the communications satellite system over to private industry and still face his Maker.

"None of us is perfect," he conceded, while around him Senators chanted, Vote! Vote!, "But as my God looks at me tonight, with all that I have done in this bill and all that I have fought to do with this bill, and all that I know that is in this bill, I can look Him straight in the face."

God and free enterprise. In the past month, as in any month, these were among the widely announced motives for many actions of Congress.

Many Congressmen voted to turn the satellite system over to a private corporation in the belief they were voting against socialism. Many newspaper stories mistakenly portrayed the Senate filibuster on the bill as a fight between proponents of free enterprise and advocates of government ownership. But, in truth, everyone was for free enterprise. As Sen. Morse (D., Ore.) explained it, the opponents wanted government control of the system so that all segments of the private economy could share in the satellite pie. The alternative, he said, was establishing a giant monopoly dominated by AT&T.

The Dark Side Of The Satellite Bill

The concentration in the news on the dramatics of the filibuster and the first successful cloture vote in 35 years largely obscured what a good case the opponents of the bill made against it. Sometimes their own behavior obscured their points. Sen. Morse, for all his virtues, irritates people and is paid too little attention by the Senate and the press. Sen. Long (D., La.) did not help the cause of opposition by sweepingly dismissing Telstar as "junk" because it cannot be used continuously all day and by first suggesting AT&T was trying to win his vote by offering to erect a building in his state and then telling reporters later he did not mean to impute a bribery attempt to the company.

But the opponents, by dint of repetition, made some things clear. Unless AT&T exercises a restraint it has never demonstrated in the past there is little in the bill to keep it from controlling most of the private and public stock in the corporation; from realizing a double return on its investment; from freezing the system into using low-orbit satellites like Telstar instead of the more efficient high orbit system still in the experimental stage; from keeping phone rates up; and from compelling USIA and other government agencies to pay the going commercial rates for its services.

The troublesome questions Morse and the others raised about letting a private corporation conduct foreign negotiations somehow never got fully answered. In the rush to push the bill through, the Senate even brushed aside changes suggested by Secretary of State Rusk and Sen. Sparkman (D., Ala.).

A Moribund FCC

Everyone agreed that effective government regulation of the private system depends upon FCC. But FCC has done a poor job of regulation in the past. The opponents showed it has never held a formal hearing on phone rates; and there has been no investigation of AT&T for 25 years. To expect an understaffed agency to regenerate itself or a Congress that rarely gives regulatory agencies enough money to do a decent job to change its habits is, as Sen. Long suggests, to base one's hopes on "phantasy and illusion."

Not much attention was paid to the evidences of AT&T monopoly power that came out during the debate. Sen. Kefauver pinpointed AT&T alumni who have recently found their way into strategic government posts. Sen. Bartlett (D., Alaska) told how the corporation apparently "neutralized" a government unit that had been successfully negotiating lower phone rates for use in the government air-raid warning system. Sen. Gruening (D., Alaska) described how AT&T misused its size to gain a dominant position in the municipal fire alarm market.

All this was largely ignored. In the impatience with the "obstructionists," in the haste to get the bill out, nothing was examined very closely. More than 200 amendments were offered and none, including one that would have inserted an FEPC clause in the private corporation's bylaws, was accepted. The bill passed the Senate by a lopsided vote of 66 to 11.

Even though he voted for the bill, Sen. Javits (R., N.Y.) objected to the way the amendments were "guillotined" and saw a need for further revision early in the next session.

If the public interest was defeated by Congressional action on the satellite bill it was served by prompt action on drug legislation. At the end of July the drug bill, watered down in committee, was expected to die with the term. But in one month the public scare over thalidomide changed that. The bill was recalled, strengthened, and as passed by the Senate with only one day of debate, should improve the safety and effectiveness of drugs. It may even do a bit to bring drug prices down. The House has still to act but no one sees much trouble there.

The miracle wrought by thalidomide has a rational explanation. Public opinion, at last, was stronger than the pressure of the drug lobbies. It also seems evident that the scare had so shaken public confidence in drug manufacturers it was bad for business.

Defense Funds And Poll Taxes

In a month in which the Senate was hamstrung by the satellite debate and the House indulged in a 10-day recess little legislation of substance was passed. The Defense appropriation, as usual, breezed through. Congress gave the President $48.1 billion for fiscal 1963, nearly $230 million more than he asked for. The House introduced one note of caution in defense money matters when it refused to give the President the $460 million he asked for fallout shelters. But it hedged here by voting $10 million for further study and research into the need for a shelter program.

Yet it is hard not to sense an element of capriciousness in the attitude of Congress toward defense. Most of the extra money was meant for the RS-70 reconnaissance strike manned bomber and the favorable vote was hailed by Rep.

Even FCC Doubts It Can Get The Staff To Regulate The Communications Satellite System

Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D., Minn.): How much additional staff do you think will be required to regulate this agency (FCC) properly?

Mr. Minow (FCC Chairman): For space alone we need 21. The real problem is not the number of people; it is the caliber. We need good, talented cost accountants and experts.

Sen. Humphrey: How is your salary structure today for obtaining these people?

Minow: Hopeless. Hopeless. . . .

Sen. Humphrey: So the carrier can pay twice or three times as much for the person that you need to regulate the carrier. The government of the United States is supposed to be able to recruit people on sort of a charity basis for the common good to regulate these giant monopolies.

—Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on the space bill, Aug. 3, 1962.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberals Fight Walter on Security, Gruening Speaks Out On Arms for Latins

. . . Gives A Satellite System Away, But Gets Good Drug Bill

Vinson (D., Ga.) as a vindication of his position in a personal struggle with Defense Secretary McNamara. This suspicion of caprice is deepened by the offhand way in which the Senate approved a bill to allow the military and air force academies to bring their cadet corps to full strength, after Sen. Long (La.) warned that the bill would be used to recruit football players. He argued reasonably, if without effect, that the future military leaders of America should be chosen on some other basis besides athletic prowess.

The vote by the House to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections by Constitutional amendment had more symbolic than actual value. Only five states still have the tax and Congress acted when it was no longer a burning issue. Nor is it surprising, in a Congress where few know the pain of segregation, that funds for segregated hospitals were included in the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and an amendment to the farm bill was defeated that would have prohibited segregation in recreational areas developed with Federal assistance.

The same mean spirit was at work in the shameful 11-month delay on Thurgood Marshall's judgeship nomination and it seems present in the conference wrangle over the aid-to-higher education bill, slated to die before adjournment if no compromise is reached.

An Excess of Chivalry

The one major piece of social legislation the House passed, the bill to give working women pay equal to men, was weakened in the floor debate. In what almost seemed like an excess of chivalry and no more, the House adopted an amendment by Rep. Katharine St. George (R., N.Y.) that substituted for the original provision of equal pay for comparable work a much more difficult standard of proof of equal pay for equal work. The Senate, which still has to consider the bill, will face another amendment that could permit an employer to reduce the pay of male employees rather than raise women's wages.

One of the most ominous developments in the past month was the attack on the present space program. In the wake of the successful flight of the Russian cosmonauts, Sen. Howard Cannon (D., Nev.) and Sen. Barry Goldwater (R., Ariz.) undertook what appears to be a campaign to wrest the space program from civilian control and turn it over to the military. In speeches that one cynical reporter said sounded as if they came off Pentagon mimeograph machines, the Senate's two reserve Air Force Generals condemned as absurd the idea that the Russian flights had no military significance and that space could be kept for peaceful purposes.

Senators Mundt (R., S.D.) and Dodd (D., Conn.) made a bipartisan bid in speeches in Orlando, Fla., to stir grass roots support for the bill to establish a Freedom Academy to teach government officials and private citizens an official anti-Communist ideology. The bill seems safely bottled up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Several members of a Senate that is rarely present for the chaplain's opening benediction continued to press for a constitutional amendment that would permit public school classes to begin their day with prayer.

One of the most courageous moments in the past month was provided by four House members, Reps. Ryan (D., N.Y.), Reuss (D., Wis.), Roosevelt (D., Cal.) and Lindsay (R., N.Y.), whose objections prevented undebated passage of a bill that would upset the 1959 Supreme Court decision in the Greene case. Sponsored by Rep. Walter (D., Pa.) and endorsed by the Justice Department, it would permit denial of private employment to "security risks" without cross-examination or court review. And it might still pass.

August was also the occasion for several excellent speeches. Sen. Gruening gave one, full of good sense, on the need to stop the military aid program to Latin America because it was creating an impoverishing arms race. Rep. Patman (D., Tex.) continued his searching examination of tax-exempt foundations and turned up a group he said use their tax-free assets to compete with private industry.

Dairy Farmers and Iodine-131

Sen. Humphrey (D., Minn.) spoke up several times for an all-out ban on nuclear tests. Such a ban, he said, was the only guarantee that iodine-131 and other radioactive substances found in U. S. food can be kept in safe limits. He noted, by the way, that Minnesota dairy farmers have had to shift their herds from open grass to stored feed grains as a precautionary measure. This and the Midwestern drive for a farm bill amendment that would compensate farmers for losses due to fallout, suggests enlightened self-interest may be winning new support for a test ban among the nation's farm groups.

But taking the month in all, it had, for liberals, more dark spots than bright ones. There is little in the record to make one proud.

Only a country that thinks a three ring circus is the Greatest Show On Earth could consider the Congress of the United States the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Millions For Defense!—1962 Style

"Even though months ago the American people ceased to take them seriously, the civil defense spenders continue to think of new ways to spend the taxpayers' money. Among their more recent half-baked brainstorms has been the acquisition of 70 million survival biscuits. The Kroger Baking Co. alone has received over $8 million in contracts to bake survival biscuits. . . .

"So now we have 70 million biscuits for nonexistent fallout shelters which are supposed to be built in prime target areas where they will be absolutely useless in a nuclear holocaust."

—Sen. Stephen Young (D., O.) Cong. Rec. July 27.

Drug Makers Can't Keep Track of ALL the Figures

Rep. Schenck (R., O.): Mr. Beesley . . . does Eli Lilly & Co. spend a substantial amount of money in research on new drugs each year?

Mr. Beesley (Lilly's President): Indeed we do. . . . This year our research budget will be between $20 million and $21 million . . . 10% of our total sales. In other words we spend approximately 10 cents out of each sales dollar in financing research.

Rep. Dingell (D., Mich.): How much do you spend on advertising out of each sales dollar?

Mr. Beesley: I do not have the figures in mind. . . .

Rep. Dingell: Would you say it was equal to the 10 cents you spend on research? As a matter of fact it exceeds the 10 cents you spend on research does it not?

Mr. Beesley: My opinion is that it does not, but I do not have the figures in mind. . . .

—Drug Bill hearings, House Interstate Commerce Committee, Aug. 20, 1962.

(The Kefauver Antitrust Subcommittee found Lilly spent 18.1 cents out of each sales dollar for selling expenses in 1958 and 8.8 cents for research.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Opening the Door to the Same Stale Russo-American Controversies

(Continued from Page One)

agreement and thus eliminate endless haggling between the U.S. and the Soviet Union over the number, manning, equipment and positioning of listening posts on each other's soil.

The general impression that the U.S. has now accepted this idea does not survive closer examination. In Mr. Dean's speech here Aug. 9 explaining the new U.S. position he placed his emphasis not on improving the neutral network but on establishing stringent international controls over the national networks of the nuclear powers. As Mr. Dean explained it, once the Soviets accept the principle of obligatory on-site inspection, then we would negotiate the number of such inspections and the number of listening posts on Soviet soil, offering to take a smaller number of each than hitherto. But these posts, while nationally manned, would be internationally supervised and the supervision envisaged is so extensive and complex as to be the occasion for just such interminable Soviet-American haggling as the neutrals had hoped to avoid.

A Semantic Juggle

To study Mr. Dean's speech of August 9 is to realize the full significance of Mr. Kennedy's answer at press conference Aug. 1 when asked whether the new U.S. bargaining position meant "we could now forego the international control posts." "No," Mr. Kennedy replied, ". . . Mr. Dean can develop our thoughts in more detail but the phrase I used is the one that describes our position on the matter—internationally monitored supervised national control posts." Eight days later at Geneva this is how Mr. Dean spelled it out—

First, it [the International Control Commission] must have rapid and reliable means of communication with the control posts. Secondly, it must be assured that all posts are operated strictly and continuously in accordance with rigid scientific standards which the Commission will prescribe. . . . The Commission must be assured that the station is operating at all times at peak efficiency, and that the data is reported continuously and accurately without jamming or interference. Thirdly, the personnel of the station should be trained according to agreed standards. Fourthly, the Commission must be assured that the instrumentation operated by the stations is constructed and equipped according to standards which the Commission must set up on a completely scientific basis. Fifthly, the Commission must be made promptly aware of all data collected by a control post. . . . Sixthly, it must be assured that the control post is located, after consultation with the party concerned, at a quiet site in a region scientifically satisfactory to the Commission.

These requirements would transform the International Commission from a means of correlating data from various national networks around the world to a mechanism for policing Soviet stations and examining Soviet detection methods which are still—like the best of ours—secret. These requirements are calculated to reopen in full rancor the stale Russo-American dispute about inspection and espionage. Mr. Dean said it did not appear "useful at this time to go into details" as to how "effective and adequate international supervision" could be assured "at all times" but the morning after the President's August 1 press conference the *New York Times* reported that "an official close to the President said the intent was that one or more representatives of the international commission would be present at each control post to make certain there was no tampering or concealment of detection information."

The neutrals had hoped to bypass stale Russo-American controversies by monitoring a test agreement from outside. These proposals open the back door to all the old disputes. Many neutrals regard the spirit as worse than the details. They see the familiar self-righteous U.S. assumption that the Russians are crooks who would enter an agreement only to cheat on it. Treaty arrangements are no more likely to survive in such an atmosphere than would a proposal of marriage based on the condition that the bride, when away from home, wear a chastity belt and leave the key at the nearest police station.

(To be concluded next week)

What We're All "Catching Up" With

"It was reported yesterday that the Russians had fired a 20 or 40 megaton atomic device. It may be that their excuse for the resumption of nuclear tests is to catch up with the U.S. I remain convinced that neither side can catch up in this perilous game in which they are engaged. There can only be one meeting place and that is universal death."

—Mr. Mou (Nigeria) at Geneva Aug. 6.

Why Not Thank Your Summer Hostess With A Subscription to the Weekly

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

9/3/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except during August and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED